arXiv:quant-ph/0610017v5 3 Feb 2007

A pairwise additive strategy for quantifying multipartite entanglement

Gerardo A. Paz-Silva[1, *] and John H. Reina[1, 2, †]
[1]*Departamento de Física, Universidad del Valle, A.A. 25360, Cali, Colombia*
[2]*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Berlin, Hardenbergstr. 36, 10623 Berlin, Germany*

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

Based on the idea of measuring the factorizability of a given density matrix, we propose a pairwise analysis strategy for quantifying and understanding multipartite entanglement. The methodology proves very effective as it immediately guarantees, in addition to the usual entanglement properties, additivity and strong super additivity. We give a specific set of quantities that fulfill the protocol and which, according to our numerical calculations, make the entanglement measure an LOCC non-increasing function. The strategy allows a redefinition of the structural concept of global entanglement.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Lx

In a previous work of ours we presented a geometrical scenario to quantify multipartite entanglement [1]. To account for the known problems exhibited by the Meyer-Wallach measure of entanglement [2], we proposed a quantity which can be evaluated for any bipartition of a multipartite quantum state. An average of such a quantity over all bipartitions would then give a measure of the entanglement of the state independently of the considered bipartition. However, the quantity proposed in Ref. [1] had the inconvenience that it did not exhibit local unitary invariance for transformations on the first qubit.

To overcome this, in this work we choose an approach whereby, instead of taking all of the possible state bipartitions, we consider all of the possible pairs. This introduces the need for a quantity that is capable of characterizing the degree of entanglement between any two given qubits. Thus, we introduce a probe quantity $\mathcal{P}(A,B)=\mathcal{P}(\rho_{AB})$ which measures the degree of non-factorizability between two qubits, not in the sense of the tangle τ [3], but with the idea of measuring the factorizability of the density matrix, namely how feasible it is to write the density matrix as $\rho_{AB}=\rho_A\otimes\rho_B$. Note that this idea is closely related to the concept of entanglement in a pure two-qudit scenario [3].

Many measures of multipartite entanglement have been proposed through different mechanisms [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In particular several authors [1, 9, 10, 11] have tried to describe the entanglement in a pure multipartite state through quantifying the available entanglement in a specific bipartition of the state and then taking on all bipartitions. This approach involves some issues: first of all, one must be able to find an appropriate unitary invariant quantity which does the trick, and second, for large numbers of qudits the amount of possible bipartitions is too big. Instead, we consider a more economic approach by resorting to all the possible two-qudit density matrices [22], expand on the consequences and advantages of this strategy, and propose specific candidates for the $\mathcal{P}$ measure.

We define our entanglement measure $\mathcal{M}$ as an arithmetical average of the quantity $\mathcal{P}$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}=\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}(A,B))\left(C_2^N\right)^{-1}\sum_{(A,B)}\mathcal{P}(A,B)\ , \tag{1}$$

where $C_2^N\equiv\begin{pmatrix}N\\2\end{pmatrix}$, and the sum is over all possible non-equivalent arrays of pairs of qubits. Note the dependence of the normalization factor $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}(A,B))$ on the quantity we use as a probe: $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q}_C(A,B))=1$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}r(A,B))=2-\delta_{N,2}$ (see below for definitions of $\mathcal{Q}_C$ and $\mathcal{F}r$). The case of mixed states would require the extension

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho)=\min\sum p_i\mathcal{M}(\rho_i)\ , \tag{2}$$

where the minimum is intended over all possible decompositions. Alternatively we can rewrite the minimization condition as follows. Let ρ be a generic (mixed or pure) n-partite density matrix, and let $\rho_{s_is_j}$ be the reduced density matrix for qubits s_i and s_j. In terms of the probe quantities, the minimization condition reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\rho)&=\min\sum p_l\mathcal{M}(\rho_l)=\min\sum_l p_l\Big(\sum_{s_i\neq s_j}\mathcal{P}(\rho^{(l)}_{s_is_j}\Big)\\&=\min\sum_{s_i\neq s_j}\sum_l p_l\mathcal{P}(\rho^{(l)}_{s_is_j})\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

This implies that the minimization condition is equivalent to minimizing the value of $\mathcal{P}$ for each two qubit reduced density matrix, that is $\mathcal{P}(\rho_{s_is_j})=\min\sum_l q_l\mathcal{P}(\rho^{(l)}_{s_is_j})$, where $\rho^{(l)}_{s_is_j}$ may be mixed, with three simultaneous constraints: i) All reduced density matrices must have the same coefficients, if the two qubit reduced density matrices are minimized by $\rho_{s_is_j}=\sum_l q_l^{(s_is_j)}\rho^{(l)}_{s_is_j}$ then $q_l^{(s_is_j)}=f_l$ for all pairs (s_is_j), ii) The set of two qubit reduced density matrices $\rho^{(l)}_{s_is_j}$ correspond to an n-partite pure density matrix ρ_l for each l, and iii) ρ is expanded by $\sum p_l\rho_l$. This definition is consistent when ρ is a pure density matrix: condition iii) requires that there is only one non vanishing q_l, thus automatically guaranteeing conditions i) and ii) and reducing to our previously defined measure. This alternative form of the minimization condition, a *pairwise minimization condition*, will be used in the proof of the properties described below. In this way we gain some properties that are desirable for entanglement measures, but that may not be so conventional or easy to satisfy [13][23]. Additivity is one good example: given two pure density matrices, say σ and η, and an entanglement measure $\mathcal{E}$, then

$$\mathcal{E}(\sigma \otimes \eta) \geq \mathcal{E}(\sigma \otimes 0_E) + \mathcal{E}(0_E \otimes \eta) \ , \tag{4}$$

where 0_E is a generic separable density matrix. If for all σ and η, equality holds then we say the measure is *fully additive*; if only the inequality is true the measure is *sub additive*. We make explicit the inclusion of $\otimes 0_E$ and $0_E\otimes$ to avoid a situation whereby, if σ and η are EPR density matrices, then we would have that $\mathcal{E}(\sigma)+\mathcal{E}(\eta) = 2 = \mathcal{E}(\sigma \otimes \eta)$, which is unsatisfactory with $\mathcal{E}(|EPR\rangle) = \mathcal{E}(|GHZ_N\rangle)$.

For the sake of clarity, consider, for example, the case of two two-qubits density matrices $\sigma_{1,2}$ and $\sigma_{3,4}$. Then $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_{1,2} \otimes \sigma_{3,4}) = (\mathcal{P}(1,2) + \mathcal{P}(3,4))/6$, since $\mathcal{P}(1,3) = \mathcal{P}(1,4) = \mathcal{P}(2,3) = \mathcal{P}(2,4) = 0$. Then additivity is fulfilled since $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_{1,2} \otimes 0_E) = \mathcal{P}(1,2)/6$, and $\mathcal{E}(0_E \otimes \sigma_{3,4}) = \mathcal{P}(3,4)/6$. A similar argument holds for arbitrary N-qubit pure density matrices. The general proof that $\mathcal{M}$ is additive requires the following extra condition. Let $\rho = \sum p_i\rho_i$, and $\eta = \sum n_i\eta_i$, be two generic density matrices in their $\mathcal{M}$-minimizing decompositions of the qubits $\{i_p\}$, and $\{i_n\}$ respectively, with $N_s = \dim\{i_s\}$. Then the corresponding minimizing decomposition $\rho \otimes \eta = \sum p_i\rho_i \otimes \sum n_j\eta_j$. We prove this by construction, here ρ and σ are two qubit density matrices. Let us assume that the minimizing decomposition of $\rho \otimes \sigma$ is given by $\rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{A'B'} = \sum q_i\sigma_{ABA'B'}$, then ρ_{AB} is decomposed as $\sum q_i\sigma^{(i)}_{AB}$ and $\sigma_{A'B'} = \sum q_i\sigma^{(i)}_{A'B'}$. We notice that even a smaller $\mathcal{M}$-decomposition for each $\sigma^{(i)}_{AB}$ can be found provided that for a generic $\tilde{\rho}$,

$$\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\rho}_{AB}) \geq \min \sum p_i\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\rho}_{AB})^{(i)} \ . \tag{5}$$

Also notice that this minimization, however, cannot be possible unless constraints i) and ii) are relaxed for this reduced density matrix. In so doing, we require $\min \sum p_i\mathcal{P}(\rho_{s's})^{(i)} = 0$ for $s = A, B$, thus releasing the constraints on $\sigma^{(i)}_{AB}$ and $\sigma^{(i)}_{A'B'}$ and allowing the possibility of a smaller minimum. At the same time we are obtaining the absolute minimum, zero, for decompositions of $\rho^{(i)}_{s's}$ for $s = A, B$, hence obtaining the minimizing decomposition $\rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{A'B'} = \sum q_i\rho^{(i)}_{AB} \otimes q_j\sigma^{(j)}_{A'B'}$, which proves the statement. We want to show that, given an arbitrary decomposition, we can always build a decomposition with a smaller value of the convex roof extension of $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\sigma \otimes \eta) \ &= \ \mathcal{A} \min \sum_i p_i \sum_{mn} P(\sigma^{(i)}_{mn}) \\ &\geq \ \mathcal{A} \min \sum_i p_i \left(\sum_{m'n'} P(\sigma^{(i)}_{m'n'}) + \sum_{mn} P(\sigma^{(i)}_{mn}) \right) \\ &\geq \ \mathcal{E}(\sigma \otimes 0_E) + \mathcal{E}(0_E \otimes \eta) \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{N}(C^N_2)^{-1}$. For arbitrary dimension a similar analysis holds, and Eq. (20) now reads,

$$\sum_{A,B} \mathcal{P}(\rho_{AB}) \geq \min \sum p_i \sum_{A,B} \mathcal{P}(\rho_{AB})^{(i)} \ . \tag{7}$$

Equation (19) is then a generalization of Eq. (20) for multipartite density matrices. Thus, the strategy provides a fully additive measure for pure states. In addition, if both Eq. (20) and Eq. (19) hold we also have full additivity for mixed bipartite and arbitrary mixed states respectively.

Our construction also guarantees strong super additivity. Note that only a few of the measures reported in the literature satisfy both the properties of additivity and strong super additivity [13]. For the latter property to be satisfied we should have, for all $\rho^{AA'BB'}$,

$$E(\rho^{AA'BB'}) \geq E(\rho^{AB} \otimes 0^{A'B'}_E) + E(0^{AB}_E \otimes \rho^{A'B'}) \ , \tag{8}$$

where $\rho^{AB} = \mathrm{Tr}_{non(AB)}\rho^{AA'BB'}$ [13], that is tracing all subsystems but A, B. We extend this definition to the multipartite case, allowing A, B, A' and B' to be multi-qubit registers. The proof that our measure satisfies Eq. (8) is as follows: Let A, A', B and B' be the qubit registers $\{i_A\}, \{i_{A'}\}, \{i_B\}$, and $\{i_{B'}\}$ respectively, and let $N_S = \dim\{i_S\}$, with $S = A, A', B, B'$. Suppose that the decomposition minimizing $\mathcal{M}(\rho^{AA'BB'})$ is $\rho^{AA'BB'} = \sum p_i\sigma^{AA'BB'}_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(\rho^{AA'BB'}) \ = \ \mathcal{A}\Big(&\sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_A) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_{A'}) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_B) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_{B'}) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_{A'}, j_{A'}) + \\ &\sum \mathcal{P}(i_{A'}, j_B) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_{A'}, j_{B'}) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_B, j_B) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_B, j_{B'}) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_{B'}, j_{B'})\Big) \left(\rho^{AA'BB'}\right) ,\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

noting that $N \equiv N_A + N_B + N_{A'} + N_{B'}$, and that we require that Eq. (19) holds. The case where $N_A = N_B =$

$N_{A'} = N_{B'} = 1$ is of particular interest, and the proof requires Eq. (20) to be satisfied.

On the other hand, analogously for AB and $A'B'$,

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\rho^{AB} = \sum p_i \sigma_i^{AB}\right) \leq \mathcal{A}\Big(\sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_A) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_B) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_B, j_B)\Big)\left(\rho^{AA'BB'}\right) . \quad (10)$$

This is so because, although we had already chosen a decomposition minimizing $\mathcal{M}(\rho^{AA'BB'})$, $\sum p_i \sigma_i^{AB}$ may not be the minimizing decomposition of ρ^{AB}. Then,

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\rho^{AA'BB'}\right) \geq \mathcal{A}\Big(\sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_A) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_A, j_B) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_B, j_B) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_{A'}, j_{A'}) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_{A'}, j_{B'}) + \sum \mathcal{P}(i_{B'}, j_{B'})\Big)\left(\rho^{AA'BB'}\right) \geq \mathcal{M}(\rho^{AB}) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^{A'B'}). \, (11)$$

The probe quantity must satisfy Eq. (19) and Eq. (20) to be strongly super additive in the most general way, i.e., $\mathcal{M}(\rho^{AA'BB'CC'}) \geq \mathcal{M}(\rho^{ABC} \otimes 0_E^{A'B'C'}) + \mathcal{M}(0_E^{ABC} \otimes \rho^{A'B'C'})$. If it only satisfies Eq. (20) then we would have a restricted strong super additivity: a pairwise strong super additivity, i.e., $\mathcal{M}(\rho^{ABCA'B'C'}) \geq \mathcal{M}(\rho^{AA'} \otimes 0_E^{BB'CC'}) + \mathcal{M}(0_E^{AA'} \otimes \rho^{BB'} \otimes 0_E^{CC'}) + \mathcal{M}(0_E^{AA'BB'} \otimes \rho^{CC'})$. We show that one of our proposed quantities satisfies Eq. (20), making it a suitable candidate for our measure.

Other properties, such as regularizability, continuity, and non lockability [13], may also be easier to prove through our strategy. Thus, we have proposed a consistent and complete measure of entanglement. The way that the additivity and the strong super additivity introduced here differ from the traditional presentation can be settled by replacing the $\mathcal{M}(|GHZ_N\rangle) = \log_2 d$ with $\mathcal{M}(|GHZ_N\rangle) = C_2^N \log_2 d$, and thus removing the $\mathcal{N}$ and $(C_2^N)^{-1}$ normalization factors in $\mathcal{M}$; this would leave us with a fully additive and strongly super additive measure in the traditional way. We next discuss some possible choices for $\mathcal{P}$.

Quantifying entanglement via probe quantities $\mathcal{P}$—. We are interested in a quantity that, unlike the tangle (which would yield zero for the two-qubit density matrices of a generalized GHZ state, thus not being a desirable quantity to average), is capable of determining how far a density matrix is from being written as $\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$. Note that we require that it vanishes if and only if the matrix is factorizable, i.e. if the two subsystems are not correlated. In contrast, the concurrence vanishes if and only if the two subsystems are not quantum correlated. Consider for example a GHZ and a fully factorizable state: for the GHZ state, all two qubit density matrices have vanishing quantum correlations whilst they have non-vanishing values for $\mathcal{P}$; the fully separable state has vanishing quantum correlations and vanishing $\mathcal{P}$. This illustrates why $\mathcal{P}$ and not the concurrence suits our strategy better. We next propose two quantities that satisfy the above requirements.

i) *The quasi-concurrence* $\mathcal{Q}_C$. Following Wooters [3], consider, in decreasing order, the eigenvalues λ_i's of the matrix $\sqrt{\rho_{AB}\tilde{\rho}_{AB}}$, where $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2)\rho^*_{AB}(\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2)$. The concurrence is defined through the λ_i's as $C(\rho_{AB}) = \max\{0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4\}$, and it can be shown to be equivalent to $2(1 - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_A]) = \lambda_1$ for the pure state case. For the above mentioned reasons, we define an alternate nonnegative quantity, the *quasi-concurrence* $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$. It is easy to convince oneself that it equals zero for any factorizable density matrix, which follows from the observation that if a matrix is factorizable then $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4$, thus yielding $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = 0$. It equals one if and only if $\sqrt{\rho_{AB}\tilde{\rho}_{AB}}$ has at most two non-vanishing eigenvalues summing one, a condition satisfied by EPR density matrices and the two-qubit reduced density matrices in a generalized GHZ state. As the eigenvalues are invariant under local unitary operations, then $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ is LU invariant. It also satisfies $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 \geq \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 = \min \sum_i p_i C(\rho^i_A B) = \min \sum_i p_i \mathcal{Q}_C(\rho^i_A B)$, as ρ^i_{AB} are pure density matrices, and thus $C(\rho^i_{AB}) = \mathcal{Q}_C(\rho^i_{AB})$. Hence $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ satisfies Eq. (20). Therefore a measure based on the strategy proposed here using $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ is both additive and pairwise strongly super additive [24].

ii) *The von Neumann's mutual information* $\mathcal{F}r(A, B)$. This measures how correlated the two subsystems in ρ_{AB} are; if $S(\rho)$ denotes the von Neumann entropy then $\mathcal{F}r(A, B) = \frac{1}{2}\left[S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB})\right]$ [14]. In this way, it is 0 if and only if ρ is factorizable and 1 for maximally non-factorizable density matrices. Then $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}_r}$ is a local unitary invariant which measures how much information we gain on average after measuring one qubit, thus a suitable measure. It is an LOCC non-increasing function for $N \leq 3$; numerical results suggest it is also an LOCC monotone for $N > 3$, however a formal proof is yet to be provided. Also it can be seen it satisfies Eq. (20), as $\mathcal{F}r$ measures total correlations which are greater or equal than the quantum correlations obtained through the convex-roof construction. We conjecture it also satisfies Eq. (19) which allows us to build a fully additive measure $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}r}$, with the nice feature that it can be readily applied to qudit systems.

It is not yet fully understood which of the above given measures more accurately quantifies the degree of factorizability, however, and for illustrative purposes, we perform below some numerical calculations using $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ and $\mathcal{F}r(A, B)$ without necessarily implying that one of them is the most accurate quantity. We have performed numerical simulations which suggest that $\mathcal{F}r(A, B)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ make $\mathcal{M}$ an LOCC non-increasing function.

First, we use $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ as the probe quantity. Let us consider the case of multipartite pure qubit states. i) For generalized GHZ states, $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle^{\otimes N}\right)$ (consider $N \geq 3$), we have $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = 1$ for all ρ_{AB}, thus yielding $\mathcal{M} = 1$, ii) for a tripartite W state,

$|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\big(|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle\big)$, $\mathcal{M} = 2/3$, and iii) for a completely separable state we have $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = 0$ for all ρ_{AB}. Second, we test for the $\mathcal{F}r$'s. Considering the same states as above, we get i) all the two qubit reduced density matrices yield $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) = 1/2$, ii) $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) \sim 0.46$ for all (A,B), and iii) $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) = 0$, respectively. Here the result of case i) may seem a non-desired one, as there would be states with $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)$'s greater than 1/2. It is interesting to note, however, that this observation leads us to the following finding. Consider the maximally entangled mixed state (MEMS) [15]:

$$\rho_{MEMS} = \begin{pmatrix} x/2 & 0 & 0 & x/2 \\ 0 & 1-x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x/2 & 0 & 0 & x/2 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{12}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) > \mathcal{F}r(A,B)_{|GHZ\rangle}$ for $x \to 1$. This does not imply, however, that we would have a value of $\mathcal{M}$ higher than that of $\mathcal{M}_{|GHZ\rangle}$. To see this, consider the smallest purification of ρ_{MEMS} [16], given by the four qubit state $|\Psi\rangle_{pureMEMS} = \sqrt{1-x}\,|0101\rangle + \sqrt{x/4}(|0000\rangle + |0011\rangle + |1100\rangle + |1111\rangle)$. Clearly $\mathcal{F}r(1,2) = \mathcal{F}r(3,4) > \mathcal{F}r(A,B)_{|GHZ\rangle}$ for $x \to 1$, but $\mathcal{F}r(1,3) = \mathcal{F}r(1,4) = \mathcal{F}r(2,3) = \mathcal{F}r(2,4) < \mathcal{F}r(A,B)_{|GHZ\rangle}$, and $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{M}_{|GHZ\rangle}$, thus illustrating the point. Here we have fixed the normalization constants in such a way that $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)_{|EPR\rangle} = 1$. The following theorem formalizes the above observation

Theorem .1 *For a N-qudits quantum state, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}r}$ is normalized to $\log_2 d$.*

Proof For $\mathcal{F}r$, we can prove that the measure is indeed normalized in the following way. To simplify the notation, we shall use $S(X) \to X$. Von Neumann entropy's strong sub additivity reads

$$XYZ \le XY + YZ - Y, \tag{13}$$

we will use this inequality intensively using different partitions at our convenience along the rest of the paper. The proof for the three qubit case Ψ_{ABC} is trivial, using S(AB) = S(C), we get that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}(C^3_2)^{-1}(A + B + C) \le \log_2 d$. For the four qubit case, using von Neumman's entropy strong subadditivity and assignations of $(X,Y,Z) = \{(B,A,C);(B,D,A);(B,C,D)\}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}r} &\le \frac{2}{12}(3B + 2A + 2C + 2D - BAC - BDA - BCD) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(3B + A + C + D) \le \log_2 d \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $S(\rho_i) \le \log_2 d$.

For five qubits, consider the following inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} XYZW &\le YXZ + YWZ - YZ \\ &\le XY + XZ + YW + WZ - YZ - X - W, \end{aligned}$$

summing for the assignations of $(X,Y,Z,W) = \{(E,A,B,C);(E,A,C,D);(B,A,D,C);(B,A,E,D);(A,B,C,D);(A,B,D,E);(D,B,E,C);(B,C,D,E);(A,C,E,B);(A,D,E,C)\}$ we get, using that in a N-qubit pure state $S(A_1,...,A_m) = S(A_{m+1},...,A_N)$

$$6(A+B+C+D+E) - 3(AB+AC+AD+AE+BC+BD+BE+CD+CE+DE) \le 0$$

$$12(A+B+C+D+E) - 3(AB+AC+AD+AE+BC+BD+BE+CD+CE+DE) \le 6(A+B+C+D+E)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}r} \le \log_2 d. \tag{14}$$

For higher number of qubits, similar inequalities can be tailored. ■

Hence, we see that according to $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)$, a GHZ state is not the state with the highest non-factorizability among its components but the one with the highest average, and thus with the highest possible $\mathcal{M}$. Moreover, if we use $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ as the probe quantity, we obtain a stronger condition: here the GHZ state not only has the highest average but the highest non-factorizability among its components.

Hence, we identify two types of states. i) *Homogeneously* entangled states: the ones for which $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$ is the same for all (A,B), and ii) *Heterogeneously* entangled states: the ones for which the values for $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$ may be different for each (A,B). In the first category we find, e.g., the W state, and the GHZ state, whilst in the second one we find m-separable states, $|EPR\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle$, $|\Psi\rangle_{pureMEMS}$, etc. In this way, we introduce the following definition: a GHZ state is the homogeneously entangled state with the highest value of $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)$ $(\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}))$

and thus of $\mathcal{M}$.

We next compute for some states that are directly relevant to quantum information protocols [17]. We consider the "$(1,4)\otimes(2,3)$" correlated product of EPR states $|\Psi\rangle=\frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle+|0110\rangle+|1001\rangle+|1111\rangle)$ [18, 19, 20], the four-qubit entangled state $|\chi\rangle=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle-|0011\rangle-|0101\rangle+|0110\rangle+|1001\rangle+|1010\rangle+|1100\rangle+|1111\rangle)$ [20], and the so-called cluster state $|\Phi_4\rangle=\frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle+|0110\rangle+|1001\rangle-|1111\rangle)$ [21]. A direct calculation yields

$\mathcal{Q}_C[\mathcal{F}r](i,j)$	$(1,2)$	$(1,3)$	$(1,4)$	$(2,3)$	$(2,4)$	$(3,4)$	$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{Q}_C}$	$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}r}$
$\lvert\Psi\rangle$	0	0	1 [1]	1 [1]	0	0	1/3	2/3
$\lvert\chi\rangle$	0	0	1 [1/2]	1 [1/2]	0	0	1/3	1/3
$\lvert\Phi_4\rangle$	0	0	1 [1/2]	1 [1/2]	0	0	1/3	1/3

which shows that $\mathcal{Q}_C(A,B)\neq 0$, and $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)\neq 0$ for $(A,B)=(1,4),(2,3)$, and equal zero otherwise. Thus, there are non-factorizable states (e.g. $|\chi\rangle$ and $|\Phi_4\rangle$) whose probe quantities yield a similar structure to that of the semi-factorizable states (e.g. $|\Psi\rangle$). Equivalently, we may define a *genuine globally* entangled state as a state for which $\mathcal{P}(A,B)\neq 0$ for all (A,B). Note that $\mathcal{F}r$ gives the mutual information of system AB, i.e. how much information we gain about B after measuring A or vice versa. Our definition would read that a state is genuine globally entangled if after measuring one qubit we gain some information about all of the other qubits in the register. In the case of the four-party states considered here, we see that we gain no knowledge of the state of qubits 2 or 3 after measuring qubits 1 or 4, i.e. qubits 2 and 3 are not correlated with 1 and 4 (see table above), and they behave, in this context, as if they were semi-factorizable and not like genuinely globally entangled states. This definition is in contrast with results reported in the literature [10, 20], in particular with bipartition strategies such as the ones introduced in Refs. [10, 11].

Remarks on the additivity of $\mathcal{M}$—. We note that the way we have casted additivity is not equivalent to the traditional way

$$E(\rho\otimes\sigma)=E(\rho)+E(\sigma)\ . \tag{15}$$

The choice we have made here is based on the condition $E(|GHZ_N\rangle)=\log_2 d$, which implied the inclusion of $\mathcal{N}$ and $(C_2^N)^{-1}$ as normalization factors. However, by choosing the normalization

$$E(|GHZ_N\rangle)=C_2^N\log_2 d, \tag{16}$$

we remove the normalization factors and hence have a fully additive measure in the traditional way. This observation is of relevance, and the same idea of the previously presented proofs holds by means of omitting the normalization factors and thus obtaining Eq. (15).

We want to argue in favor of the way we introduced additivity in the first part of this work. Additivity is a desired property based on the intuitive observation that if Alice and Bob have two EPR pairs they must have twice the amount of entanglement than if they only share one EPR pair. Our formulation is consistent with this observation, but an important consideration regarding the size of the qubit register holds. In order to compare two EPR pairs with one EPR pair we must consider the right scenario, and the question can be posed in the following terms. Suppose Alice and Bob share an EPR pair, hence they have a fixed amount of entanglement. If they manage to create another EPR pair, then how much entanglement do they share now? The answer is, as we have shown earlier, that they should double the amount of entanglement. However, if they can create a second EPR pair, it means that they had at least four qubits at their disposal in the first place, which has been illustrated by the $\otimes 0_E$ and $0_E\otimes$ terms in our formula. Thus, our formulation of additivity indeed shows that the strategy provides an additive measure of entanglement. For completeness we cast the traditionally additive measure we reach after the discussion above

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^T=\sum_{(A,B)}\mathcal{P}(A,B)\ . \tag{17}$$

Either of the two measures, $\mathcal{M}$ or $\mathcal{M}^T$, depends on the choice of additivity we make. For illustration we now recast the proof of additivity in the traditional way. Recall that we have already shown that $\mathcal{F}r$ and $\mathcal{Q}c$ satisfy Eq.(20), and thus we have a fully additive measure.

Theorem .2 *(Traditional additivity)*
The entanglement measure $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^T$ is fully additive, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}(\sigma\otimes\eta)=\mathcal{E}(\sigma)+\mathcal{E}(\eta)\ , \tag{18}$$

provided

$$\sum_{A,B}\mathcal{P}(\rho_{AB})\geq\min\sum p_i\sum_{A,B}\mathcal{P}(\rho_{AB})^{(i)}\ . \tag{19}$$

Proof The proof basically relies on the pairwise minimizing condition. Consider two generic m and $N-m$ qudit density matrices, η and σ, thus it guarantees that there exists a bifactorizable decomposition of the form $\eta\otimes\sigma=p_i\eta^i\otimes q_i\sigma^i$. Our plan or the proof is the following: we will assume that we have a generic, non-bifactorizable, minimizing decompostion, and we will show that the bifactorizable decomposition has a lower value of entanglement following the convex roof construction recipe. For simplicity we will show it here for the $m=2$ case, however the argument is easily extrapolated to the multipartite case.

If we have a non-bifactorizable decomposition of the form $\rho=\sum p_i\sigma^i$, then we have that there are non-vanishing pairwise minimizing decompositions for ρ_{12}, ρ_{13},ρ_{14},ρ_{23},ρ_{24} and ρ_{34}, with values denoted as $f(\rho_{AB})$.

On the other hand, a bifactorizable decomposition would have other values for their minimizing decomposition, namely $g(\rho_{AB})$, and in particular some of them vanish, $g(\rho_{13}) = g(\rho_{14}) = g(\rho_{23}) = g(\rho_{24}) = 0$, which implies that $g(\rho_{13}) \leq f(\rho_{13})$ and similarly for $(1,4)$,$(2,3)$ and $(2,4)$.

Now, the proof would be complete if we demand that $g(\rho_{12}) \leq f(\rho_{12})$ and $g(\rho_{34}) \leq f(\rho_{34})$. This is equivalent to demand that the lowest value achieved by any decomposition is on pure state matrices, namely on a decomposition $\rho_{AB} = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha \rho^\alpha_{AB}$ where ρ^α_{AB} is a pure density matrix. This is equivalent then to demand that

$$\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\rho}_{AB}) \geq \min \sum p_i \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\rho}_{AB})^{(i)} \ . \tag{20}$$

as claimed. The extension of the argument to more qudits is straightforward, and would leave us with the condition

$$\sum_{A,B} \mathcal{P}(\rho_{AB}) \geq \min \sum p_i \sum_{A,B} \mathcal{P}(\rho_{AB})^{(i)}, \tag{21}$$

where the minimization is intended over every possible decomposition on pure states. Note that if this is true then any decomposition on mixed states will yield a higher value of entanglement. ∎

We have presented an alternative approach for quantifying multipartite entanglement. In so doing, we have proposed entanglement measures based on pairwise strategy which naturally exhibit, in addition to the usual entanglement properties [4, 12, 13], additivity and strong super additivity. We have given a set of measures which fulfill the role of $\mathcal{P}(A, B)$ and are LOCC non-increasing functions according to numerical results. Our proposal shows that the pairwise analysis strategy is very effective for quantifying entanglement and that it also guarantees most of the non-conventional properties of entanglement measures. In addition, we have also shown that such a strategy allows a redefinition of the structural concept of global entanglement.

We thank T. Brandes and C. Emary for useful comments on the manuscript. We gratefully acknowledge financial support from COLCIENCIAS under Research Grants No. 1106-14-17903 and No. 1106-05-13828. GAPS thanks G. H. Paz, I. Silva, G. R. Paz and D. F. Gutierrez for support.

---

[*] E-mail: `gerapaz@univalle.edu.co`
[†] E-mail: `j.reina-estupinan@physics.ox.ac.uk`

[1] G. A. Paz-Silva and J. H. Reina, to appear in Phys. Lett. A. Available as an E-print at arXiv:quant-ph/0603102.
[2] D. A. Meyer, N. Wallach, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4273 (2002).
[3] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[4] V. Vedral *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
[5] V. Coffman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
[6] G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 355 (2000).
[7] D. Pope and G. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 052107 (2003).
[8] A. Acin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1560 (2000).
[9] C. Emary, J. Phys. A **37**, 8293 (2004).
[10] T. R. de Oliveira *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 010305(R) (2006); see also quant-ph/0603215.
[11] A. J. Scott, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052330 (2004).
[12] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, arXiv:quant-ph/0504163.
[13] M. Christandl, quant-ph/0604183 and references therein.
[14] N. Cerf and C. Adami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 5194 (1997).
[15] W. J. Munro *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 030302 (2001).
[16] See, e.g., M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, CUP (2000).
[17] C. H. Bennett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
[18] J. Lee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 052318 (2002).
[19] G. Rigolin, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 032303 (2005).
[20] Y. Yeo and W. Chua, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 060502 (2006).
[21] H. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (2001); N. Kiesel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 210502 (2005).
[22] One can see that by calculating the number of nonequivalent bipartitions and the number of all possible pair of qubits, after $N = 5$, the number of bipartitions outnumbers the number of pairs.
[23] In this section we will explore mainly two properties: additivity and strong super additivity. As we want it to be consistent with the normalization condition $\mathcal{E}(EPR) = \mathcal{E}(GHZ_N)$ we are not casting them in the traditional way. The reader must not be deceived however, we will also show in subsequent sections that replacing the above condition for a suitable normalization condition where $\mathcal{E}(EPR) \leq \mathcal{E}(GHZ_N)$, and thus removing the normalization factors on $\mathcal{M}$, leaves us with traditional additivity and strong super additivity, thus showing the nice properties of our strategy.
[24] We conjecture that $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ also satisfies Eq. (19), hence is both fully additive and strongly super additive.